

MSc314  
Interiors  
Buildings  
Cities

An  
Architecture  
For Art

**Research  
Plan**

**Yiyin Yu  
Matthew Tan  
Mikołaj Cichocki**

## Table of contents



|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction  | 02 |
| The modern art museum as public space (week 1)                | 04 |
| The modern art museum as urban event (week 2)                 | 13 |
| Culture, race and privilege in the modern art museum (week 3) | 15 |
| List of references  | 16 |
| List of Figures   | 16 |



Working as a collective is a foundation of the Interiors Buildings Cities group, in which the authors of this research plan are engaged in the 'Palace' graduation studio. The design proposal for the new building of Museum of Contemporary Art Antwerp - M HKA (figure 1) will be a result, but the process started by carefully examining the world of contemporary art through iteration of readings, lectures, podcasts, and group discussions. It allowed us to constantly formulate and re-formulate ideas and positions on the subject, starting from the core question of what the art actually is, through issues of the character of public engagement, politics, internationality, and inclusiveness of the art world, all in strict relation to architecture and methods of display. Results of that part of the project were compiled in form of this collective report.

The precedent study, in which the studio examined eight museum buildings through cross-referencing, model making, and analytical drawing happened simultaneously to the research seminar, and drawing the correlation between often very broad and abstract ideas and real pieces of architecture should allow for a successful implementation of the preliminary research into the architecture we create. Forming a collective body of knowledge was the primary goal, and the group character of the process proved to be highly influential for each of our own individual statements. Those are supplementary to this document, in which we tried to find a balance between our own reflection and analytical summary of thoughts formulated by the authors.

The seminar was divided in three parts all concerning the issues of the modern art museum, namely the "public space", "urban event" and "culture, art and privilege", and the structure of this paper follows that division. However, in the following chapters you will see how the points brought up by the authors – Mark Pimlott, Charlotte Klonk and Darby English supplemented by the recordings often intertwine and touch upon the same factors. To us this asks to embrace the non-linear character of the architectural research project, and we decided to keep the timeline and division of the reflections, which do therefore go back and forth between the concepts, informing one another as our understanding of the topic increases.

In the first part, the inquiry focuses on importance of defining contemporary art, basing on the lecture given by British artist Grayson Perry. Later, his remarks allow for a conscious peek at the relation between gallery spaces of modern art museums, and their public, in context of the article "Visibility, Spectacle, Theatricality and Power: the problem of the museum" by Mark Pimlott.

Later, the writing looks at the modern art museum by examining its ties to the global consumer market, and the event culture. The notions of consumerism, art tourism and international profile of the cultural institution come to the foreground in the chapter by Charlotte Klonk, to be exemplified by case study of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, in an interview with its director. Throughout, an attempt is made to place the new ideas in the local context of the graduation studio.

Lastly, focal point has been moved towards inclusivity of the cultural world. By looking at the dynamics of privilege and discrimination both broadly and in specific case of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, the relevance of positioning a new contemporary art museum cautiously aware of those issues becomes obvious. Issues discussed in that part, if further developed, should have a strong influence on the architectural strategy that needs to be used to shape the new building for the M HKA.

The questions we pose are often unanswered, they are however, to form a base for the next phase of the inquiry. We sincerely hope that using this work as a starting point will allow us to broaden the expertise through research that is to follow, and by asking right questions establish a successful graduation project.



figure 1. Current location of the M HKA in Antwerp.

## Week 1 - The modern art museum as public space



**Source:** BBC Radio 4 - The Reith Lectures, Grayson Perry - Playing to the Gallery, Beating the Bounds<sup>1</sup>

### Defining contemporary art

In his lecture, artist Grayson Perry tries to define the boundaries of contemporary art. He questions whether anything can be art if we want it to be the case. The importance and impulse of answering this question, according to Perry, lies in the value of art for society, mainly its humanistic, sociological, and philosophical importance. However, a complementary incentive might be the economical factor: the art world of today is being valued at 23 billion pounds, giving all its parties: the artists, museums, galleries, funders, collectors, and curators a personal motive to define its boundaries. This personal monetary motivation of its parties surely adds a layer of complexity to the posed question. Furthermore, as art perception seems to be very personal, and every individual is free to formulate their own opinion about it, is it fair to define a right or wrong version of contemporary art?

The definition of art throughout its history has been subject to many changes. The way we see it today goes back to the 14th century, yet before this time paintings, for example, would sometimes be considered a dishonourable art. In the end of the 19th century the modernist movement already started questioning the art of that time in different ways. Later, in 1917, Marcel Duchamp unveiled his sculpture "Fountain" (figure 2) which was a ready-made urinal signed and placed in an art gallery. With this piece, Duchamp showed that anything can be art, but not everything is art. This goes to show that its perception is mostly dependent on the values of the society in which it operates. The definition of art is highly changeable and inseparable from the art movement and way of thinking at a particular time.

At the end of his lecture, Perry gives a list of eight criteria, which he uses to distinguish an artwork from something that is not. To him, to distinguish contemporary artwork one needs to ask:

- 1) Is it in a gallery?
- 2) Is it a boring version of something else?
- 3) Was it made by an artist?
- 4) Is it a big and expensive photograph?
- 5) Does it have a limited edition of copies?
- 6) Is it computer art?
- 7) Is it being stared at by particular people?
- 8) Would it still be recognizable as an artwork, having been thrown at the rubbish dump?

Those are all well considered, however the artist seems to omit the role of intention, which we view as core aspect of any artistic work, if it is to be treated and approached seriously. Therefore, to our belief an additional criterion needs to be introduced, namely "is it made with the intention of being art?". There is no doubt that despite similar outcome on the surface there is a vast distinction between a person who throws a pile of rocks on the floor on accident, and an artist, who lays down a pile of rocks on the floor with a purpose in a certain, well considered way. The idea behind his actions is required, even the most prosaic one.

Despite that small clarification, Perry's criteria seem to be relatively successful in their task of identifying contemporary art. Treated as a whole, it appears that many of them have a direct relationship with the art institution which is the imposed environment of art encounter. Being in a gallery context (number 1), something big and expensive (number 4) and seeing other people staring at it (number 7) all have to do with the viewing of art in these institutions and increasing the value of the works by looking at them. Indeed, the relation of the artwork, the public, the gallery and the influence all of those have on spatial manifestation of the exhibition spaces seems to be standing out. Mark Pimlott's article discusses those issues in great detail.



figure 2. Duchamp, Marcel. The Fountain. 1917.

## Week 1 - The modern art museum as public space



**Source:** Pimlott, M. Visibility, spectacle, theatricality and power: the problem of the museum.<sup>2</sup>

The article discusses shift of the relation between viewers and works of art over the period of museums' existence, which is reflected in apparent differences in their interiors through the years. In his writing Pimlott shows how, unlike their predecessors, contemporary artists question the definition of modern art and terms of its production, making those issues a valid part of the work itself, which goes into dialogue with spaces of display. The spatial quality of rooms where the artwork was placed and exhibited, has thus become an integral part of modern art. The notion that viewers perceive the work within a prescribed spatial setting, seems therefore to be an indispensable part of its valuation.

### The questionable "neutrality"

White cube's purity and neutrality are derived from the language of functionalism and anthroposophy. Its purported "neutrality" offers a direct, simple solution that can host all kinds of work while having a relatively neutral influence on their appearance. Its popularity can surely be linked to that symbolic purity and simplicity. A typical nineteenth century museum usually offers spaces with lavish interior decorations. In that case, the architecture of the museum holds a strong individual character that the visitor gets to recognize. In a way, the white cube as a space that is purged of all of those elaborate efforts also forms a type, by removing anything that seemed unnecessary. Therefore, it also becomes familiar, on a very other side of the spectrum. It is easily recognizable by the public and conveys stability like a currency that can be used everywhere in the world. Its purity also means that it can be repetitively produced and is suitable in many situations regardless of what kinds of artwork it is to display. But what happens when the "White Cube" becomes a symbol, an embodiment of value assigned to high art? And what if it is itself helping to establish that value? If the impact of the artwork is perceived largely dependent on its spatial context, can that context still be called neutral? It seems that the aura linked to those spaces became so affluent, that the inherent value of the artwork itself is sometimes placed at an inferior position, and the international art fair market needs the existence of a white cube as a shiny brand tag to confer the value of their product. As an architect in a position of spatially establishing a new cultural institution this is asking to consciously treat the white cube as something more than just a neutral backdrop for colourful works of art. Would breaking its orthodoxy overturn the current valuation system of modern art? And how it could be done? Furthermore, is it something that the architect should be involved in?

The case of Städtisches Museum Abteiberg (figure 3.) proves, that a complex, customized setting is achievable by using different spatial structures and typologies within the same building. This sort of highly customized encountering experience is however largely depended on the craftsmanship of the architect, with many unsuccessful examples like the extension of the Van Abbemuseum in Eindhoven (figure 4.) making the approach questionable. Besides, such architecture escapes reproduction and can hardly be classified into a specific type. The question it poses, however seems to be crucial – to what degree should the exhibition space interfere with and confront the work it displays.

### Staging of the museum

In the article Mark Pimlott underlines the link between the museum spaces and a certain type of spectacle, that happens within them. The contemporary art gallery is less of a preserving container that simply focuses on its artefacts, in contrary it becomes a theatre of many actors that holds a certain atmosphere influencing the experience of the collection. As the critic Michael Fried described<sup>2</sup>, the "theatricality" has replaced the "real and intimate" relation between viewer and the work of art. To us, theatricality can be interpreted differently through different lenses. Hans Hollein's project described above, for example, is an experimental case that treats the architectural space as a piece of art and tries to encourage a dialogue between the building and the artworks. The architect said once in an interview that "what is most attractive about museums placed in old palaces is that their spaces are interesting"<sup>3</sup> and he tried to apply similar strategy in his design.

Buildings like the Museum Abteiberg re-emphasize the importance of architecture being an independent part of the gallery, instead of subordinating to the artworks. Yet, as proved above the scenography of the white cube also carries a strong meaning in its own way. If the museum is a stage, a question needs to be asked who is to decide what that stage should be like? Is it the architect, the founder, the artists, the curator or the public?





figure 3. Hollein, Hans. Städtisches Museum Abteiberg. 1982. Model recreation of the gallery space.



figure 4. Cahen, Abel. Van Abbemuseum (extension) 1991-2002. Photo of the gallery space.

## Week 2 - The modern art museum as urban event



**Source:** Klonk, C. The Dilemma of the Modern Art Museum.<sup>4</sup>

### Spectatorship and consumerism

In the chapter titled “The Dilemma of the Modern Art Museum” Art Historian Charlotte Klonk looks at the thin line between art spectatorship and consumerism, pointing out factors that to her belief formed current consumer profile of the museum visitor. The contemporary art museum after Second World War started to play into its role within the capitalist market influenced by commercial and ideological success of events like the Kassel’s Documenta, an art festival which by its dispersed structure and periodic character promotes temporal, immersive encounter of the artwork. Yet, it was not the market itself that conceived that profile of the museum. The Documenta of 1955 was cautiously outlined as political stand against Soviet Union. By manifesting western values so close to its borders, the first curator and creator of the exhibition Arnold Bode strived to symbolize Germany’s rebirth and re-connect it with Europe and the West. He did so by exhibiting in a way that condoned their values, drew a sharp line between the past and the present and chose a very international profile after years of fascist xenophobia. The dawn of consumerism in the museum sphere was therefore a method of political alignment in a period of political turmoil, which Klonk describes with nuance. Nevertheless, Bode’s exhibition was the first to move presentation to the foreground with temporary, showroom – like arrangement (Bode was an interior designer) of international works forming sensory immersive environments (figure 5), and in many ways introduced ideas of art consumerism. As a result, art tourism, concomitant pursuit of novelty and event culture became part of art reception worldwide. Contestation of that state by multiple artists through years, which in most cases took form of room filling installations, did not change the status quo. On contrary, it facilitated further unification of museum space taking form of materially expensive, shop – resembling white rooms of different proportions – the white cube, with all its characteristics described in previous chapter. The museums differ in (outside)form but are excruciatingly similar inside. In such spaces, the spectator – consumer, for whom museums are sequences of immersive visual pleasures, not very different from shopping trips on the weekend, spends his leisure time.

### Museum as part of the society

Despite arguably pessimistic undertone, all the above does not necessarily imply harsh criticism of the evil market. In contrary, if considered an integral part of the system, contemporary art and its institutions worldwide can be seen as exemplifying its nature and adhering to its needs. The Museum and the way it operates thus reflects the spirit of society, as it did in Germany in the 1950’s. This position, formulated by Klonk at the end of the chapter seems to be particularly important, for it questions how to approach museum of contemporary art as both the building and a social construct, especially from the standpoint of the architect.

If anything, the ongoing research shows immense complexity of the power dynamic behind the museum, visible in the constant struggle of importance between the artists, the institution, and the curator (curator-hero in Klonk’s words). Added to the mix, the investor, and the architect become prolific voices that shape the institution, influencing the aforementioned by their decisions. If so, we should question to what extend the act of architecture needs to re-formulate the idea of the museum, based on one’s self-conscious and judgemental reflection on its history. If the museum is to reflect the society, perhaps the most viable solution would be to follow its guidance, and by studying the city from the Urban, Social and Artistic standpoints distinguishing elements, that reflected in architecture could host the particular mode of operation of the M HKA in Antwerp? We believe that such act will not only help to establish a national institution embedded in local context, which is a part of the task, but could also bring answers to other viable questions that need to be tackled.

In the following chapter we will discuss one of those, which we labelled “the programming” looking at the case of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (figure 6). Should the museum be inward oriented, or internationally profiled and acclaimed? Or perhaps can/should it do both?



figure 5. Bode, Arnold. The Documenta - I. 1955. Display of a sculpture by Gustav H. Wolff and paintings by Giorgio Morandi. The art is placed in a whitewashed unfinished interior, paintings hanged on translucent milk curtains.

## Week 2 - The modern art museum as urban event



**Source:** The Bilbao Effect #1: Bilbao, Spain. Guggenheim Bilbao's director general discusses the city's world renowned transformation.<sup>5</sup>

### Programming of the museum

The Bilbao Effect is commonly oversimplified as a strategy of uplifting dysfunctional or degenerated post-industrial location by embedding a cultural institution encased in flashy, detached architecture. Such building is then to become a popular sight, creating tourist movement that generates new sources of income for the economy. However vastly questioned by Vidarte, who emphasizes the role of the masterplan, in which such project must be rooted, the case of the Spanish city does seem to prove that such action, if properly programmed can be successful. It is important to understand, that even though Gehry's project and the curatorial strategy of the museum were both vastly criticized for lack of respect they had for the local context, the local character was never to be in the core of the museum (for the international, western visitor was a destined target). In a way they were both responding to well – crafted strategy of detachment (figure 6), and the way in which they did it so coherently is what made them successful at the end. The fact that the programming, which included the urban strategy, the art, and the business, was there from the beginning allowed for it to be reflected in Gehry's architecture, conceiving a prosperous institution. One might argue that the reception within the art world was far from positive, and it seems obvious that repeating such approach in Belgium of today would be a mistake, not in line with M HKA's expectations. Yet the concept seems vital and asks for further questions to be posed, which are to help the architecture to be a part of coherent strategy. What is the purpose of The Museum? What is it trying to represent? What function does it want to serve within the city? To whom does it want to appeal? Or does it want to appeal to anyone at all? What is its identity? Where does the money come from? Those, which could be subsumed by the core "what is the goal?" should form the basis of further inquiry during the project, as the dynamic correlation between them, the site, the history, and the collection should be mitigated by the architecture we create.

### The local importance

In the podcast, the director mentions psychological effect that the museum has had on the local population, as it showed that being brave and confronting is a great attitude to induce change and ambitiously face the challenges of the future. It made people of Bilbao proud, and it did so despite (or because?) being international, not local. Yet it seems that sense of national achievement played bigger role here than the character of an actual institution.

Such realization brings to the fore the aspect of identity which should be a focal point when designing a public building. In one of his lectures, British architect Stephen Bates said, that "the façade is the face of the city"<sup>6</sup> and in many ways the Guggenheim Bilbao became just that. That face is not only formed by the architecture. Public cultural institutions bear responsibility to the public which they represent, and the profile should allow to be identified with by the locals. An aspect in which the Guggenheim as international art institution with its international collection in constant move did rather poorly. Should a building like the new M HKA strive to become a new face of Antwerp in that sense? Or maybe a place that already has so many faces requires something that will let them all thrive? Do people of Belgium need to be proud of their museum? Maybe, in that case the sense of importance needs to be inward oriented not extravagantly appealing to foreigners? For the moment we do believe that to be the case, nevertheless the idea of representing the public and notions of inclusivity that such actions ask to consider, is an important theme on its own.



figure 6. Gehry, Frank. The Guggenheim Museum Bilbao. 1994-1997. Building with it's surroundings.

## Week 3 - Culture, race, and privilege in the modern art museum



**Source:** BBC Radio 4 - Thinking Allowed, Culture and Privilege.<sup>7</sup>

### Culture and privilege

In an earlier podcast, artist Grayson Perry already stressed that art has a great value derived from the influence it has on the society, its humanistic development and philosophical discourse. Governments and art organisations often share similar view, claiming that culture brings joy to many lives and unites communities worldwide. As proud members of diverse educational institution we believe that, universally, exclusion of races or other groups of the society should never be accepted. Especially not in culture, as it is subsidised or partly subsidised by the government and should therefore adhere to all members of the nation. This underlines from the financial standpoint the somewhat obvious argument: culture, and art, should be open to all people.

Yet, the work of Orian Brook (fellow at the University of Edinburgh) seems to prove that it's not that simple, and the inequalities do exist, on which he talks in a broadcast titled "Thinking Allowed, Culture and Privilege" from the BBC. His study on those issues notices an exclusion in cultural occupations, making women, people of colour and individuals from working class backgrounds experience systematic disadvantages when employed in cultural institutions. This shows throughout the process of gaining experience and has an effect on being promoted. Unfortunately, according to Brook, as very small percentage of people in England and Wales ever visit art galleries, theatre, or opera, the overall number of participants of the so called "culture" is small, and the inequalities tend to go under the radar.

The first of them highlighted by the podcast shows itself in relation to terms of cultural work: some groups are chosen more often to occupy senior roles in cultural institutions. Those are primarily white people, those coming from noble backgrounds in particular. In contrast, women (and black women especially) are rarely able to work on such positions. If looked at in broader context the reasons for such standpoint are probably concerning society in general and are not only limited to the cultural institutions. The idea that the museums' structure follows the society has already been discussed, however a question needs to be asked what to do if that process facilitates discrimination. Nevertheless, even if the reach of the issues makes them hard to solve solely on the institutional level, it does not mean that an effort should not be made to so. Moreover, cultural institutions might be contributing to these societal differences actively, by limiting access to art display. It might be that they are condoning a certain norm, the one of the white male artist, for example. Playing into that amplifies the inequality, excluding parts of the population from spaces of display, which then become hostile, unwelcoming, or not understanding at the very least. This was the case for the black artist community at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which will be analysed later.

The second inequality highlighted in the podcast is the one of cultural consumption (viewing of culture, concerts etc.) and cultural participation (making art, paintings etc.) of different population groups. There is a big number of people who do not participate in cultural activities. A large part of the population goes to cinemas, pop music concerts or reads a book, but only small percentage dances, plays an instrument or goes to opera. We think that people should be free in how they choose to spend their leisure time. They could prefer going to a bar or watching sports on the TV, yet this should not exclude them from the culture shall they want to re-join. The preceding notion of inclusiveness should apply here equally. No group should be excluded, and everyone should be able to enjoy the art in museum spaces, that welcome them.

The M HKA as an institution that is to reformulate itself is in a unique position to give everyone an equal chance to engage with culture actively and passively, possibly even bring the public in, starting at very young age. There is a relation between the intensity of art encounter during childhood and consumption/participation with culture at a later age. By seeking collaborations with cultural centres and elementary schools in all different areas of Antwerp, the M HKA can target younger people of all backgrounds by hosting music lessons, art days and gallery visits, making everyone feel welcomed to encounter the art. After studying feasibility of such action this could well become a part of the programming of the new building (understood as a coherent strategy as mentioned above) to be later translated into the architecture of the new building.

## Week 3 - Culture, race, and privilege in the modern art museum



**Source:** English, D., Barat, C. Blackness at MoMA: A Legacy of Deficity.<sup>8</sup>

### The criteria and curatorial strategy

The most straight forward answer to the question of how and why MoMA's criteria operated that allowed that fluency would be the one of bias. After all, the museums are systems run by humans and are therefore inherently depended on people in charge to shape the policy accordingly. When introducing racial blackness into the museum, and we must not forget that it was a time, in which the concept was still a novelty for an older generation of white American's, problems like an obvious western egoism seem almost unavoidable. Their actions, which might well be genuinely angled towards inclusivity, often terribly missed the point as mentioned in the critical review written by art historian Thomas McEvilly about the 1984 exhibition titled "Primitivism in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern". Let's examine that case to understand the concept further.

Nearly 200 pieces taken from indigenous African, Oceanian, and North American cultures are chosen to be displayed together with artworks conceived by famous western modern artists like Pablo Picasso. An attempt was made to draw a descriptive narrative between the two, looking for the roots of cubism within the tribal imagery and aesthetics. However it might be questioned whether every day, religious indigenous artefacts might be considered contemporary art (according to Greyson Perry almost certainly not) the exhibition did bring the objects made by black people in front of the public. On the other hand, trying to re-contextualize those indigenous objects within means of modern western art history and aesthetic evaluation of form and proportions, disregards their original purpose. Such act suggests inequality in evaluation, making the object merely a support for the acclaimed western creation. Blackness seems to be then looked at and defined through a western lens instead of being welcomed and accommodated in its actual character.

Another problem arose when some people advocated creation of separate wing for black artists, which was very much against MoMA's policy. It seems that the chances of works by black artists getting displayed in the museum would increase, if there was a separate section devoted to their creations. It is a valid argument, yet a question needs to be asked would that segregation contribute to a real inclusive system or, it contrary, deepen the gap between black artist and the rest of the world. Imposing, that they are somehow different from anybody else, even though there is supposed to be equality in any other aspects of the society, to which the art responds seems very naïve and plain negative. In addition, if black artists get a separate wing, should the same apply to other minority groups? Separation tends to lead to further segregation and museums could then end up being dispersed between various wings with particular curatorial criteria. Real equality is achieved not by announcing minorities as special or different but by incorporating them into the whole of the society, and their art into the whole body of contemporary art. The authors concluded that a more inclusive MoMA should be a MoMA in which black artists are just "one artist among others", and it should be true for all backgrounds, no matter the ethnicity, religion, or place of origin.

### Social responsibility of the art institution

Darby and Barat discuss the efforts that MoMA has undertaken during the Civil Rights Movement related to the social justice and fight for equal rights of black people in the United States. The responsibility that is to be taken by institutions like MoMA and how these efforts can help to improve social justice are discussed in this section. Various activities, events, and programs in different scales and engaging different communities are developed to close the gap between museums and the public, making the museum a place more available for all communities. Transferring the "Museum of Children's Art Carnival", and building the Studio Museum in Harlem, are symbolic gestures of giving previously unprivileged people an offspring of the institution into their own hands, thus acknowledging them, and including their identity within the profile of the whole. End even though yet again the beginnings were marked by lack of nuanced understanding from the decisionmakers of the museum, and the curatorial strategy deeply faulted, for which MoMA was criticised, it showed that the contemporary cultural institution should treat aspects of inclusivity very seriously, as it can make a great impact. However, these activities have also proved that achieving full inclusion of minorities into modern art museums, or further, into society cannot be achieved merely by certain groups of interest, a societal acceptance and effort is required to pave the way for the art and the community.

### Architecture of inclusivity

Issues raised here are vital for the architectural strategy of the museum, for they seem to point towards spatial structure, that would help to avoid exclusion. If as hinted in previous chapter the new M HKA is to represent members of Antwerp's society, at its core diverse, consisting of different parties and groups of interests, the aspect of how to make sure that no one stays out requires further examination. Especially, as the institution is to be funded by Flanders, which is just one of those groups.



## List of references



1. BBC Radio 4 - The Reith Lectures, Grayson Perry - Playing to the Gallery, Beating the Bounds. (2013, October 22). [Video]. BBC. Retrieved September 22, 2022. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03dsk4d>
2. Pimlott, M (2021). Visibility, spectacle, theatricality and power: the problem of the museum.
3. Pettena, G. (1988c). Hans Hollein: Works 1960-1988. Riverside Book Company. pp. 56-64
4. Klonk, C. (2009). The Dilemma of the Modern Art Museum. Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800 to 200. New Haven.
5. Intelligence, f. (2021, September 24). The Bilbao Effect #1: Bilbao, Spain Guggenheim Bilbao's director general discusses the city's world renowned transformation | fDi Podcast [Video]. Retrieved September 28, 2022. <https://play.acast.com/s/fdipodcast/thebilbaoeffect-1-bilbao-spainguggenheimbilbaodirectorgeneraldiscussesthecity-sworldrenownedtransformation>
6. Bates, S. (2019, September 9). Lecture given at TU Munich.
7. BBC Radio 4 - Thinking Allowed, Culture and Privilege. (2021, September 8). [Video]. BBC. Retrieved October 11, 2022. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m000zdv1>
8. English, D., Barat, C. Blackness at MoMA: A Legacy of Deficity in English, D., Barat, C., & Wilson, M. (2019, August 20). Among Others: Blackness at MoMA (Illustrated). The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

## List of references



**figure 1** - Current location of the M HKA in Antwerp. <https://www.rebelgroup.com/en/projects/a-new-location-for-the-museum-of-contemporary-art-in-antwerp/>

**figure 2** - Duchamp, Marcel. The Fountain. 1917. Photograph by Alfred Stieglitz at 291 art gallery following the 1917 Society of Independent Artists exhibit, with entry tag visible. The backdrop is The Warriors by Marsden Hartley. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fountain\\_\(Duchamp\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fountain_(Duchamp))

**figure 3** - Hollein, Hans. Städtisches Museum Abteiberg. 1982. Model recreation of the gallery space, photo by the authors.

**figure 4** - Cahen, Abel. Van Abbemuseum (extension) 1991-2002. Photo of the gallery space. Photo by Peter Cox. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/the-making-of-modern-art-at-van-abbemuseum-eindhoven-the-netherlands-8828/>

**figure 5** - Bode, Arnold. The Documenta - I. 1955. Display of a sculpture by Gustav H. Wolff and paintings by Giorgio Morandi. Retrieved from source 4. p. 177.

**figure 6**. Gehry, Frank. The Guggenheim Museum Bilbao. 1994-1997. Building with it's surroundings. Photo by the Guggenheim foundation.

MSc314  
Interiors  
Buildings  
Cities

An  
Architecture  
For Art

**Research  
Plan**